

REMARKS

Claims 71, 73 and 75-77 are pending. Claims 71, 73, 75 and 77 have been amended. Claims 72, 74 and non-elected claims 78-80 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claim 76 is allowed and that claim 74 recites allowable subject matter. Although claim 74 has not been rewritten into independent form, applicants submit that amended claim 71, which recites the subject matter from allowable claim 74 (now cancelled), is patentable over the prior art for substantially the same reasons as claim 74.

Claim 77 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. The above amendment to claim 77 is believed to obviate that rejection and its withdrawal is requested.

Claims 71-73 and 75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over U.S. Patent 7,079,696 (Koide). Claim 71 has been discussed above. The cancellation of claim 72 renders its rejection moot. Applicants submit that amended independent claims 73 and 75 are patentable over Koide.

Amended independent claim 73 recites, inter alia, means for creating N items (where, N is a positive integer equal to or greater than 2) of encoded data from one received content and means for merging the N items of encoded data on a frame basis with the N items of encoded data shifted by M frames with each other, and also shifted in time by M frames with each other when distributed.


Koide, at col. 8, lines 4-20 and 50-53 (the portion cited in the Office Action), discusses compressively encoding using a discrete cosine transform. However, the cited portion of Koide does not teach or suggest the feature of amended claim 73 of merging the N items of encoded data on a frame basis with the N items of encoded data shifted by M frames with each other, and also shifted in time by M frames with each other when distributed. For at least this reason, amended independent claim 73 is believed patentable over Koide.

Amended independent claim 75 recites a similar feature and is believed patentable for substantially similar reasons. Dependent claim 77 is believed patentable for at least the same reason as its base claim.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: October 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Joseph W. Ragusa
Registration No.: 38,586
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1633 Broadway
New York, New York 10019-6708
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant